

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**November 26, 1996
PM**

6:30

Chairman Robert called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Robert, Wihby, Reiniger, Clancy, Domaingue

Messrs.: Robert MacKenzie, Chief Driscoll, Richard Davis, Richard Houle,
Asst. Solicitor Arnold, William Jabjiniak, Hugh Moran

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Robert advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

- A. 1997 CIP Budget Authorization:
2.20710 Hepatitis B Immunization - Closeout

- C. An amending resolution allowing for the acceptance and expenditure of FAA funds by adding the 1997 CIP 7.30271 Rotating Beacon Tower - \$42,385 MAA, \$381,304 FAA.

**HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF
ALDERMAN WIHBY, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN REINIGER,
IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.**

Chairman Robert addressed item B of the agenda:

- B. An amending resolution and budget authorization allowing for acceptance and expenditure of MHRA funds by adding the 1997 CIP 4.10302 MHRA Undercover Officer -- \$50,000 -- MHRA.

Alderman Domaingue said she had a question in regarding the funding for this Undercover Officer the amount is \$50,000. From what she had read this is for one officer undercover. Is that correct?

Chief Driscoll stated that for a long period of time the Manchester Housing Authority has helped us with the funding of that officer who works undercover. It is not for a single period year, it continues until that funding is run out and then they fund it again. Chief Driscoll continued to say that this was probably the fourth year that we have had it going.

Alderman Domaingue asked then the date saying is that the completion is 1997 that is just a formality. What salary level is he at?

Chief Driscoll answered that it depends on the salary level the individual officer assigned what his B step or L steps are.

Alderman Domaingue continued by asking if this was a standard cost for an Undercover Officer?

Chief Driscoll replied that it was.

Alderman Domaingue said it is, okay. Is this limited to MHRA properties?

Chief Driscoll answered pretty much. His primary responsibility is MHRA properties but within reason he is allowed to follow investigations as they lead from there.

Alderman Domaingue asked if this funding is part of the MHRA budget not the Police Funds.

Chief Driscoll replied yes.

Alderman Domaingue asked where the origin of the funding? Where does the money come from?

Chief Driscoll answered Federal money, I'm not sure. Chief Driscoll asked Mr. MacKenzie if it was Federal money.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes it was.

Alderman Domaingue said that was a nice blanket answer. Can you be more specific than that. How about we don't hold up the Committee process and you provide me with that information when it is more convenient for you. Thank you.

Mr. MacKenzie said okay.

Alderman Domaingue moved to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item D of the agenda:

- D. Informational update from the Planning Director relative to the Elm Street Reconstruction Project.

Alderman Domaingue said she had a quick question of the Director of Planning. You refer here to \$58,000 HUD funded portion. Then you go on to talk about a total of approximately \$160,000, is that in addition to the \$58,000 or is that the total inclusive?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that was the total for the design, engineering, and survey.

Alderman Domaingue asked if it included the \$58,000 from the HUD funded portion?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes that it did.

Alderman Domaingue asked where the rest of the money is coming from?

Mr. MacKenzie stated that they still had to ear mark where that's coming from. We are still trying to organize the grant from HUD it does take quite a while to do. We are hoping to get at least a portion of that before we have to finalize the design.

Alderman Domaingue said that by putting this on the consent calendar you are asking this Committee to go ahead and approve this. Despite the fact that we have no idea where this money is coming from, is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie informed the Committee that their attempt was to try to get the project started April 1 so that it can be done in one construction year. At this point, if we don't get the surveying done before the snow flies, which it is starting to. They may not be able to complete the engineering this winter and therefore the project would slide for another year.

Alderman Domaingue replied that she heard what his intent was and I agreed with him that the project needs to be done. Her point was that we are on the record as knowing as a Committee that you are asking us to fund something we have no idea where the remainder of the funds are coming from.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that we would, in essence. The Highway Department would contract with the consulting firm for only the phases they would actually have money. They would not contract for the full \$160,000. We expect that by the time they get the first two phases done we will know where the balance of funds is coming.

Alderman Domaingue stated that she hoped we have them, Mr. MacKenzie. I will move it.

Alderman Domaingue moved to receive and file the communication from the Planning Director. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Richard Davis, Executive Director, Intown Manchester, requesting that the City allocates \$2,500 for repairs that are required immediately to the Chase Building.

Alderman Clancy said that they had a fire in that building and they want to upgrade the building. We want to make it look good.

Alderman Wihby asked what about the building across the street. That is vacant too. I know it's not owned by the City, but still.

Mr. Davis said that was correct, he is working on that with Mike Reed of....

Alderman Clancy asked if the Homestead owned that restaurant?

Mr. Davis answered yes exactly the McDonough family. I have been in touch with Mike Reed, Stebbins Realty to contact those owners. They have agreed to let us decorate those windows for Christmas. We will work with them, of course, in the future to try to upgrade that store front.

Alderman Clancy said it would be nice if we can both get the buildings done. Even if we had to get some kids from the High Schools to come down and put some kind of display in the window or something like that. It would be real nice.

Mr. Davis agreed and said that was the design piece they were working on now.

Alderman Clancy continued by saying that the only thing he hoped is that if we do sell the building we could probably get some this money back. If we do auction off or we keep it for ourselves, fine.

Mr. Davis said he would hope so and he believed that the City had a plan to redevelop that building and that Mr. MacKenzie has already presented.

Alderman Clancy said okay he would move.

Alderman Domaingue said she had a question where was the \$2,500 coming from.

Mr. Davis replied that the only funds that he would be aware of are the Downtown Improvement Fund, which is the Central Business District Revolving Fund, there was monies allocated in this year of about \$400,000 of which a portion of that has already been ear marked. The monies would be available there if the Committee would so wish.

Alderman Domaingue said that was her question where is it the Intown Management Manchester asking us where to take the money from?

Alderman Clancy contingency or what?

Mr. Davis replied from the Downtown Improvement Fund.

Mr. Houle said that he received a call earlier today from the Tax Collector Joan Gardner. She had a concern about the possibility of removing that gate. She had no problem if the gate was raised but to remove it didn't make any sense and frankly it doesn't to me either.

Mr. Davis answered that it can be raised and not removed.

Mr. Houle continued by saying that he suspected that electricity was cut to that building, but I really don't know that.

Mr. Davis stated that was correct. Any electricity that we would be able to get in there would be on a temporary basis. We would basically have to bring it in from the pole that is outside.

Alderman Clancy moved to recommend that the City allocate \$2,500 for repairs required immediately to the Chase Building, such funds to be expended from the Downtown Improvement Fund. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from the Planning Director relative to a request from the NH Regional Development Corp. for \$700,000 in Federal funds for a six-month bridge loan at one percent (1%) interest to assist with acquisition and pre-development costs for a substantial housing rehabilitation project located Downtown.

Mr. MacKenzie said that he would just like to discuss a little bit and there are representatives of the group interested in this rehabilitation project if the Committee wanted to hear from them. Several months ago as you may remember we talked about what should be the Housing Policies. Generally the policy that came out of the Committee was that we should be focusing primarily on home ownership that we have been. In certain instances there may be appropriate rehabilitation projects and we would bring that back to the Committee just to discuss it. This is a project, fairly large, rehabilitation project of existing buildings it's up on the northern part of Elm Street across from the Sears building. There is a series of row houses and it also involves a couple of buildings right behind the Sears building. Overhaul I think it's close to over 100 units that would be rehabilitated as part of this. The development group that is interested in the project would be asking the City for basically a bridge loan, which would be about \$700,000. They would like to close on the project, I believe, before the end of this year in order to get the majority of funding would be coming from other sources. Investment tax credits and other sources, so they would be hoping to get a bridge loan that would then be repaid within six months in full to the City. Several representatives of the group are here tonight if the Committee would wish to hear from them.

Alderman Wihby asked if this group had anything to do with other groups that we have working on housing?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no.

Alderman Wihby said this is a brand new group to Manchester.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that they are individuals who have been working in Manchester that are involved in this group. I believe the group as an entity is new to Manchester.

Alderman Wihby asked if we have ever done anything like this before?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that we had a similar project was the Brook and Canal Project. Where the City assisted it wasn't a bridge loan, it was a long term loan. That building on the corner Brook and Canal Street have recently been renovated and it has been completed. That particular one came out fairly well. They use the same type of vehicles, the income tax credit, historic tax credits, for rehabilitating the building.

Alderman Wihby said they are asking for \$700,00 in Federal Funds?

Mr. MacKenzie said that we would normally utilize either two funding sources. One home funds which are specifically entitled to the City each year. The City gets about \$550,000 each year for projects similar to this. We could also use, if appropriate CDBG, Community Development Block Grant Funds, for this type of project.

Alderman Wihby asked what if it took longer than six months or there other financing does not come through. Does that jeopardize anything else that we are doing?

Mr. MacKenzie stated that he would think we would want to be relatively clear before we get into the project that there are various forms of guarantees that it would be paid back. For instance, if there commitments from other banks and institutions, perhaps the developers could answer those type of questions?

Alderman Wihby said he would like to here that. What his concern was is this going to take away from any other projects that in fact they don't get funding and six months turns into ten years.

Chairman Robert asks is Mr. MacKenzie could answer that.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that he would have the same concern. I would like to have the right vehicles to protect the City's' interest.

Chairman Robert asked if there were any other questions for Mr. MacKenzie before we hear from the individuals involved. Chairman Robert called the developers to the microphone and asked them to identify themselves for the record.

Ms. Naczas introduced herself as Kathryn Naczas and she lives here in Manchester at 18 Wolf Street.

Mr. Duffley introduced himself for the record. His name was Steve Duffley and he lives on 330 East High Street.

Alderman Domaingue said she had a question for Mr. MacKenzie. The description here is housing program is there some type of Federal guidelines that we are going to have meet with respect to this loan.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that we would have, if we use home funds, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, have specific criteria that we would have to follow. If they are using historic tax credits there is also rehabilitation standards that they would have to follow.

Alderman Domaingue asked what the guidelines for the housing?

Mr. MacKenzie answered in terms of the prices that would be asked?

Alderman Domaingue continued by asking if we are talking about purchases here or renovations so they can actually be purchased. If so, are their income guidelines.

Mr. MacKenzie replied okay. The project would be purchased in total, the buildings. They would be rental units, there would be guidelines for incomes for those individuals and they would be set rental amounts each month. So it would be a rental project.

Alderman Domaingue said she would like to hear from these individuals but she had one more question relative to the City Solicitor's office. What is the liability for the City of Manchester if we enter into this type of arrangement and it falls through?

Mr. Arnold said that he guessed the worse case scenario liability might be that we do not get our \$700,000 back. Properly structured, I do not think the City would incur liability for the project.

Chairman Robert said they could start with questions. Chairman Robert recognized Alderman Reiniger.

Alderman Reiniger asked Mr. MacKenzie whether the project would stay on the tax rolls.

Mr. MacKenzie said that it was his understanding that it would be a taxable property.

Alderman Wihby being recognized ask as far as the funding goes? Could you elaborate?

Ms. Naczas replied that they just received word from the Federal Home Loan Bank that we have had our application sent to Washington. Typically and historically when it is sent to Washington it's pretty firm commitment from the Federal Home Loan Bank. We have applied for \$2.99 million that we expect to hear from on December 15 if we have received approval from Washington. I would expect that we would in turn take that commitment letter and give that to Mr. MacKenzie. So that you had assurance that in March those funds would be available to repay the City and also to go forward with the acquisition.

Alderman Wihby remarked that they would not go forward until you are sure that you have a commitment anyway.

Ms. Naczas answered that was correct. Ms. Naczas continued to say that they would not take the risk of the \$700,000 unless we knew we had money to pay it back.

Chairman Robert asked what type of housing they were planning on?

Ms. Naczas asked in terms of income you mean?

Chairman Robert said yes type of customer.

Ms. Naczas replied that it would probably be low and moderate income. It could run the gambit from very low to moderate. I know that they are some Housing Certificate recipients there. We are not doing any type of project base subsidy.

Chairman Robert asked what currently existed there?

Ms. Naczas replied in terms of income. Based on the rents I would say you have working poor there. You only have 25 percent of the rental units that are subsidized. The balance of the units are people paying their own rent which are roughly around \$500 or \$550. My guess would be that they are working poor.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. MacKenzie if this would be designated low income housing? If they use this money could this be properly used in a different way in the future.

Mr. MacKenzie responded that it was a question he had. He believed that the main controlling criteria would be the investment tax credits. They require a there be certain eligibility for the occupants. Now that expires in 15 years or at least it has to be refinanced in 15 years. Is that correct?

Ms. Naczas responded in 10 years and held for 15 years.

Mr. MacKenzie continued by saying that there would be an option for that neighborhood if it started to go up scale in 10 to 20 years. I think there would be an option to refinance the entire package and allow for more market rate housing. Would you consider that to be a correct statement.

Ms Naczas nodded yes.

Chairman Robert asked if it would be an appropriate building for market rate housing? Or is just the nature of the building suggest that it would have to be low income?

Ms. Naczas responded that she guess that would depend on the future of the City of Manchester. It's hard to say.

Mr. Duffley said that when they were built they were nice. They had fireplaces in 40 of the units. The interior hardwood finish is still intact in a lot of the units. They are very impressive units, so I do think they have a potential if ever they could be up scale.

Alderman Domaingue being recognized by Chairman Robert asked only because she hadn't caught the answer. What percentage of the units would be subsidized?

Ms. Naczas responded that currently based on what we know of the tenants approximately 25 percent

Chairman Robert asked if that's what there now? You are not planning on displacing anybody?

Ms. Naczas said that there would be no displacement 100 percent to acquire.

Chairman Robert asked how many units are in there now.

Ms. Naczas responded that it was a total of 100 units that they were looking to acquire.

Alderman Reiniger said that he understood that there is a Social Service component in this program. Could you elaborate.

Ms. Naczas replied that they also had there Social Service person with them. Mr. Jay Lane.

Mr. Lane noted that he lived in Goffstown but spent a lot of time in the Manchester area having worked for the Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority roughly for 22 years. While at the MHRA I was the Director of Social Services and Resident Services. We have a distinct plan in mind, we are going into the development of these buildings doing two things. One, we are going to provide affordable housing. Second, we are going to develop a plan to work in a comprehensive manner with the residents in those buildings. We have already gone throughout the community talking to a number of Human Service Agencies from Optima Health Care to Catholic Charities, to the Security Deposit Loan Fund to the University of New Hampshire in Manchester. Talking about what we could do in the event that we secured this property. For example, the University of New Hampshire, as many of you may be aware we have applied for somewhere of around \$400,000 this summer to develop a micro campus in the enterprise community. We did not receive funding for that, however, what we propose to do

is to take a portion of that plan and implement it in this building or in this area. In addition to that, Optima Health Care we have talked to those folks about developing some comprehensive health programs and education programs. Programs that effectively will work in concert with some of the welfare reform that we are talking about in the State. So we can get folks into a self sufficient situation they will not be relying on federal subsidies and they will not be relying on other Social Services Network. That is what the plan is looks like in concept and we have already developed a decent partnership base and we have some sense as to where the funds are going to come from in order to provide some of these services we are talking about. Any questions?

Alderman Clancy recognized by Chairman Robert asked if Mr. Lane and Steve were working together on this project.

Mr. Lane responded that they were.

Alderman Clancy said that he knew Steve had done some plan work in the City area and I compliment him on the work he did. He did some work on Auburn and Maple, Merrimack and Maple and Auburn Street. He did some nice work.

Mr. Lane said that we have taken a close look at the demographics in these buildings and there is a large minority population in these buildings as well as about 26 of the units house exclusively elderly folks. We have a long record of developing assisted living programs, alternative housing programs for frail elderly folks and we look at these buildings as an opportunity to implement programs that will provide supportive services and effectively keep people out of institutional.

Chairman Robert recognized Alderman Reiniger.

Alderman Reiniger said that he supported the proposal so he moved that it be accepted.

Alderman Wihby said he would second it but he wanted to know what normally would happen here. Is Planning and the Solicitor going to get together and something going to come back to the full Board? What normally happens?

Chairman Robert asked Mr. MacKenzie what would be the normal procedure?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that normally we might only bring back to the full Board an amending resolution if we have to allocate funds differently in a startup. If the Committee of the full Board would like to see some of the final contract agreements just for their information. I think we could perhaps arrange for that, but certainly we would have the Solicitors office look at it.

Alderman Reiniger moved to support the proposal, Alderman Wihby seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from David Plante, PSNH, requesting to acquire an additional piece of easement from the City to accommodate running more aerial fiber optic cables to the US Sprint Facility on Candia Road.
(Note: communication from the Board of Assessors dated 11/8/96 enclosed.)

Mr. MacKenzie said that he knew that US Sprint presented some proposed towers to the Planning Board but this particular site does not ring a bell.

Chairman Robert asked if there was anyone here representing US Sprint.

Mr. Arnold said that with the information that I have on the agenda quite frankly could not tell.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. MacKenzie if the appropriate place to get the information on this would be the Highway. Do they check this out.

Mr. MacKenzie replied he did not believe this would be the Highway Department. I think it would primarily be the Assessors and the City Solicitors office. Unless it was related to the site plan before the Planning Board, but this particular one is not. I am not familiar with this one myself.

Chairman Robert stated that the Committee needed more information. With having an Assessor and whoever looked at this with the Planning Department or a representative from US Sprint comes here and explains that to us. Would that be appropriate?

Mr. MacKenzie agreed that yes he thought so.

Chairman Robert stated that this item should be tabled and request that.

Alderman Clancy motion that item #6 be tabled pending further information from the Assessors and US Sprint representative, Alderman Domaingue seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 7 of the agenda:

Discussion relative to the School cleanliness report received by the Aldermen.

Chairman Robert noted to Mr. Houle that he knew the Committee had some questions. They are relative to the reports that they have been receiving from the School Department. Could you take a minute to elaborate on how the whole program has gone over the time period we have had it and maybe we can lead into some questions from the Committee.

Mr. Houle started by saying that is was kind of difficult since this is the third year we are into contract. For the past couple of years, we have a system that has developed with the Assistant Superintendent in which the deficiency notes are to be forwarded on a daily basis. Each teacher or any one else in the School report to the Principal and they turn the facts to us. In addition to that kind of monitor we have two full time inspectors. One on the second shift, one on the third shift, and at times they are both on the third shift. Because that is the time of day we can best inspect to see if there has been contract compliance. Overhaul if we look at a building we know that there are so many deficiency notes that could come into that building. Basically for all schools on a daily basis that the contract did absolutely nothing. They would be two thousand seven hundred and some odd deficiency notes. Basically we are running about a 2 percent deficiency or 2 percent of the physical plan. One way of looking at it, is that it is not being cleaned on a daily basis. We in turn for the month September, October and November have penalized the contractor approximately \$6,000 -- \$8,000. I would be happy to respond to any specific questions the Committee may have. The only other thing I want to say is that the report that came to the Aldermen is structured in such a way that if a Principal has had a problem any one day of the month. It's appropriate for him to check that off and it's difficult to differentiate whether this is 23 problems for the month and it is with all of the classrooms. It is not as effective as the deficiency note system in our own inspections that we have in place.

Chairman Robert stated that he wanted to lead off with a couple of questions. When we embarked on this venture, we embarked on this with the idea that we are probably going to have to fine tune it, if things did not work right. In my interest here tonight I want to know what they are saying is there any validity to it? I don't want to get off on a wrong tangent, I want to say is there something that would be appropriate to be able to change the contract maybe to require something different to make this work more efficiently.

Mr. Houle responded not that he was aware.

Chairman Robert said that you mentioned the performance of the contractor. There tends to be a 2 percent deficiency is it reasonable to expect that 2 percent is always going to be that way or can we shrink that a little bit. Get that so it is clean all the time.

Mr. Houle said that their aim and their goal was to get 100 percent compliance.

Chairman Robert asked if it was realistic to expect that.?

Mr. Houle stated that given human nature and given what it is I think it is unreasonable to expect it. Anything is 100 percent at any given time or at any given endeavor. I think that is being realistic.

Chairman Robert asked whether he thought we they were getting the best they can get.

Mr. Houle responded no he did not. I think we can close that number, but I think occasionally we are going to have problems. They are going to be ongoing we are going to have to continue to monitor. We cannot rely solely on teachers telling us what may or may not have happened. We have to do our own inspections as well and we really have to stay on top of the contractor.

Chairman Robert asked whether he had the supervisory people to do that? Do you have the people in place? Do you have the apparatus in place?

Mr. Houle responded that they did.

Chairman Robert asked if the Committee had any questions.

Alderman Wihby being recognized by the Chairman ask if we were getting 100 percent then they did in the past?

Mr. Houle responded that they were not measuring then.

Alderman Wihby said then would you say we were getting 100 percent then?

Mr. Houle said no he would not.

Alderman Wihby asked if we were getting 98 percent.

Mr. Houle said he did not think so. We had vacancies at times that exceeded 20 percent of the total staff. Back in those days if we had people 20 percent of the people out very clearly 20 percent of the cleaning did not get done.

Chairman Robert asked Alderman Wihby if he was all set then recognized Alderman Clancy.

Alderman Clancy noted that since the winter is here. Snow is coming we have already had a couple of flakes out there are the janitors going to shovel the snow or are you going to hire private people.

Mr. Houle said that the Custodial Contractor is responsible for removing the snow.

Alderman Clancy asked and the parking lot?

Mr. Houle responded as they always have, yes.

Alderman Clancy stated that was a little different from last year is that right?

Mr. Houle said that it was different from two years ago actually. The first year when we got off the ground we did have to move in there. But again the snow removal budget is separate from the contract we authorize it. We do not take the cleaning custodian off duty as we did in the past and say all right tonight you are going to shovel. What we do now is we authorize the snow removal and we estimate what it is going to be and we authorize X number of hours. That is done with our Contract Supervisor working closely with the Contractor Supervisor. It is authorized so we are not paying for something in addition to or different than.

Alderman Clancy said that he new we had some surplus equipment like buffers and lawnmowers. Do we have any snow blowers in that building? I was hoping, the reason I am asking this question. I hope that each school has at least one snow blower, because I know one guy, last year that was working for this outfit he almost had a heart attack shoveling snow.

Mr. Houle responded that basically that was up to the Contractor to provide. The equipment we have specified what he does provide. Getting back to the equipment that we own, this Committee some time ago authorized the distribution of the department surplus to other departments. We have done that, we still have some surplus equipment we will be bringing a recommendation of the disposal of that to the Committee again in the near future.

Alderman Clancy asked do we have any snow blowers?

Mr. Houle said he did not know, we may have but I do not know. The good equipment was picked up by P & R and Highway Department.

Alderman Domaingue said that we pay someone an individual out of the City to oversee or supervise, as Alderman Shea very amusingly put it. To oversee or supervise the Supervisors, is that correct?

Mr. Houle said that they oversee the Contract not the Supervisors.

Alderman Domaingue asked the person we hired to Supervise the Contractors is that one individual or is it more than one individual?

Mr. Houle responded that there was three individuals.

Alderman Domaingue repeated three individuals!!

Mr. Houle stated that there was one responsible for it and there were two that actually did the inspection in the evenings.

Alderman Domaingue noted that the inspection took place in the evenings.

Mr. Houle said for the most part.

Alderman Domaingue said why did she continue getting reports from Principals. I can deal with a little bit of dust, we can accept 2 percent if there is shift there in cleanliness. But if I have a cleaning crew out there and they don't have what it takes to make sure that the doors are locked. We are expending millions of dollars and very expensive computer equipment. Somebody is not doing their job. Now, I do not care which somebody it is but it needs to be corrected and it cannot continue.

Mr. Houle said that we agree.

Alderman Domaingue stated that she did not want to have this discussion anymore. Not at this level, not at the full Board level, I want it down and that is my position and I'm only speaking for myself as an Alderman. I do not want to hear this conversation again, because if I do I am going to be asking the gentleman who runs the department cannot get the job done. Thank you.

Chairman Robert asked if there were any other questions by the Committee. If no one has any other questions, we seem to be getting these things where we are probably going to get them regularly. Are you saying that what is coming from the School Department is probably not realistic. It's not an accurate representation.

Mr. Houle said that it is not an accurate picture.

Chairman Robert continued by asking if anyone from the School Department ever says to you or gives you the impression that they had something on their mind that they wanted to alter the system somehow. This may be a means to getting it done.

Mr. Houle said that he did not have any good feeling for that. I just do not know what causes concern over what I consider relatively low rate of deficiency.

Chairman Robert said that they are doing it for a reason. We are going to continue to get these things.

Mr. Houle wanted to add that he is meeting with the Building and Sites Committee and the Board of School Committee this coming Tuesday evening. Basically, this is the sole item on the agenda. School cleanliness and I will be going into more detail but generally speaking the sense of what I just gave you is the bottom line.

Chairman Robert asked if he would advise as to what was discussed and what the major points were so we could make some sort of recommendation back to the Board. The Board referred this to the Committee, I guess my question is what do we send back as a response. It seems to be there is a problem over there and I am not sure what it is. Could you let us know what your outcome of your meeting is?

Mr. Houle said that he would.

Chairman Robert said that he would recommend tabling this item till he gets back with talking to the School Department.

Alderman Clancy asked what are the questions that the Principals are mainly asking you. What are their demands? Is it the bathrooms, the sink, the floors?

Mr. Houle said that it was some of everything. In terms of toilet rooms, one of the other initiatives were taking is in the high schools we are developing some policing forms for the toilet rooms that are custom to each school and we expect the day custodian to make the rounds of all of the toilet rooms. Two or three times a day, now we expect them to sign off on these, tells us what time they were there and if corrective action was required what they did. Now, frankly I do not hear the concerns from the Principals with the exception of one sometimes, maybe two. You hear from the Board of School Committee. It seems to be different. It seems to be a far greater problem by the time it gets to the Board of School Committee.

Alderman Wihby said it's pretty bad when you have to send someone to the bathrooms three times a day to mark down that they have been there.

Mr. Houle responded by saying we are attempting to do what we have to resolve the concerns.

Alderman Clancy said that what is going to happen. The day janitor will become a Security Guard. If he is going to walk around all day, who is going to do the work.

Chairman Robert said that it is teachers that will make it part of their job.

Mr. Houle said that Mark was doing security.

Alderman Domaingue motion that this item be tabled until Mr. Richard Houle met with the Building and Sites Committee and Board of School Committee,

Alderman Wihby seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 8 of the agenda:

Copy of a communication from Mayor Wieczorek requesting review of a proposed "Bag & Tag" program.

Chairman Robert said he would like to take item 8 at a separate meeting so I do not want to address that this evening.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Robert continued by saying that we had an item of new business.

Motor vehicle prosecutor. Solicitor's office.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. MacKenzie if he would speak to this, please.

Mr. MacKenzie started by saying that Mr. Tom Arnold is here and probably has more information. This is a State Grant that the City received and City Solicitors Office was hoping to get it up and running very quickly.

Alderman Domaingue had a question that was not this under personnel as well?

Mr. Arnold responded yes. Mr. Arnold continued by saying the reason it came in front of this Committee is this Grant that we received is basically a reimbursement grant. It is for the purpose of setting up what I call a wash account with CIP so we can pay the additional prosecutor and they get reimbursed via Federal Funds.

Alderman Clancy asked if we did not just have a policeman working in your office.

Mr. Arnold answered yes and he went back to the Police Department.

Alderman Clancy asked why he did not keep him.

Mr. Arnold said he would have liked to however, but he chose to go back to the Police Department.

Chairman Robert stated then that it was his choice.

Mr. Arnold agreed that it was his choice. We would have loved to keep him, he took a leave of absence from the Police Department for a year and at the end of the year he chose to go back to the Police Department.

Chairman Robert called for questioning.

Alderman Domaingue asked with this reimbursement arrangement where is the money now going to come from. Since we have to set up what you refer to as a separate account. A wash account is that what you used.

Mr. Arnold responded that he understood, that is the word I used. I understood that there is CIP funds that would enable us to do that.

Alderman Domaingue noted where are these funds?

Mr. MacKenzie said that he was going to pass the buck to Mr. William Jabjiniak.

Mr. Jabjiniak said that the funds are from the State of New Hampshire, the Highway Safety Agency. It is a one year grant, retroactive to October 1 of this year. In other words, it is going to take them some time to get the position up and going.

Alderman Domaingue said I appreciate that answer, but it did not answer my question. Where is this money coming from right now to pay this individual until we are reimbursed?

Mr. Jabjiniak said that the Grants themselves are on a reimbursement basis so as they process they will pay them out of there operating budget these funds then they go back in as a reimbursement basis.

Alderman Domaingue said so you are telling this Committee that the funding for this position is coming from the City Solicitor's budget is that correct?

Mr. Jabjiniak said yes to be reimbursed by this grant.

Alderman Domaingue stated that it is actually coming out of the City Solicitor's budget that's for the record is that we know where this money is to be coming from.

Mr. MacKenzie said he is not sure if that is exactly correct. We do have several reimbursable accounts and normally, Federal regulations require that it is on a reimbursable basis. We provide them bills and then they will reimburse the City for those bills.

Alderman Domaingue noted that in this case we are providing the salary and then at the end of this period of time they will reimburse us. So we obviously have to have the cash account out of which to pay this individual. Where is that money coming from? And the answer was the City Solicitors budget.

Mr. MacKenzie said he did not believe that was correct. This will be set up as a CIP account. Therefore, the money will come from this account. Now it is reimbursable so the funds will be there and it will probably come out of cash balance that the City carries in general through the Finance Department. If there is a Cash balance available because there is quite a bit of money that the City carries forth on a cash basis. The money would come from that and then the funds reimbursed by the State Fund to that account.

Alderman Domaingue addressed the Chairman and said she did not have any opposition to this matter. However, I think this is a good time to raise the question are we as a Committee going to get a really good report on where this Cities CIP program balances stand. Could we arrange to have that as part of the Committee meeting in the future before the budget process?

Mr. MacKenzie said he would be happy to answer any questions, right now.

Alderman Domaingue replied that she wanted to see the whole thing.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that he could explain the whole thing right now, if you would like.

Alderman Domaingue stated that she would like to set up a separate Committee meeting, because we are getting near 7:30 PM. Alderman Domaingue felt that it was time as Committee Members that they knew where the balances are and what is available. What direction they take, she felt that it would be helpful to them in the budget process.

Mr. MacKenzie replied okay, but he would like them to invite the Finance Department for these types of Grants which are on a reimbursable basis. They will explain how they finance those payments on an interim basis because that's what it was. They finance those payments on an interim basis until payments are

made. Most CIP cash accounts that you are talking about the Alderman allocate that fund as part of the budget process. This year, for example, it was \$1.6 million which part of that was for the parking revenue fund. That money is earmarked specifically for cash projects.

Alderman Domaingue said that would be wonderful. Alderman Domaingue asked Chairman Robert if they could do that.

Chairman Robert replied yes. Chairman Robert noted that they would invite Finance to explain. It would make more sense to everybody after it is explained.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Amended Resolution and Budget Authorization Relative to 4.20106 Motor Vehicle Prosecutor be approved. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Robert asked if there was any other discussion? Question?

Alderman Clancy asked what the \$10,273.68 fringe benefits. How do you break that down?

Mr. Jabjiniak replied 35%.

Alderman Clancy said you use it, go ahead. Some people use 35%, some use 38%.

Chairman Robert noted that this was going to go to personnel. Mr. Moran is here.

Mr. Moran said that recently in the past couple of days the Finance Department has re-calculated the fringe benefit package and has determined that it is at 35%.

Chairman Robert called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert noted that there were tabled items. Chairman Robert asked Mr. Rist if he was here to speak to a particular item.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted that the following item be removed for the table for discussion.

Communication from the Director of the Manchester School of Technology requesting authorization to obtain a "G" plate for a 1992 Dodge van for use in the GOAL Program.
(Tabled 11/12/96)

Chairman Robert continued by telling Mr. Rist that the Committee had some questions. Chairman Robert addressed the Committee and asked if they had the opportunity to read the communication.

Alderman Wihby asked what is the MST fund?

Mr. Rist replied that the MST fund held by the Manchester School Department. Those are the funds that we generate within the building. That is held by the School Department under the School Finance and that is all processed through purchase order and check request and cleared through the City Finance Office.

Alderman Wihby continued by saying it's funds from like if you build and shed and then you sell a shed.

Mr. Rist answered exactly, yes.

Alderman Wihby said we talked about this some time ago. The money that you make for the building goes into the MST fund. Whatever material you are going to use to build another one, you go into that fund and withdraw it from that fund.

Mr. Rist said yes, years ago we controlled all that ourselves in our building. However, that has been moved to the School Finance. We no longer have the ability to write checks and send out purchase orders, that type of thing. Each program that generates revenue gets to retain that revenue in a profit center that is reinvested into the program.

Alderman Wihby asked if the moneys that they make from flowers are different from the money that you make from the building sheds.

Mr. Rist answered yes.

Alderman Wihby continued by asking that was all kept somewhere you can get to later where you can buy seed or to buy wood or whatever you want to do.

Mr. Rist replied yes. Each program that generates funds has its own profit center, has it's on cash balance and that revolves fiscal year to fiscal year.

Alderman Clancy asked if there was a cap on it?

Mr. Rist replied not that he was aware of, no.

Chairman Robert asked if there were any further questions.

Alderman Wihby asked if they received funding from the School Department?

Mr. Rist answered yes they did.

Alderman Wihby wanted to know what they did as far as this was concerned. They let you keep this because it is used for the program.

Mr. Rist stated that in fact they were saving basically the tax payers hundreds and thousands of dollars in supplies that normally they would have to foot the bill for. It also generates works for the kids. We sell a shed. We are very entrepreneurial and somewhat self sustaining as far as consumable supplies. Obviously the overhead, the salaries, the building, the utilities and all that is paid for by the City.

Alderman Wihby asked if they acknowledged that you have this money when they are making your budget out?

Mr. Rist replied yes they did. If the carving machine goes down, we probably pay for it. The Simplex System, we pay for a lot of things that a normal school would not be ask to cover.

Chairman Robert asked if Alderman Wihby was all set.

Alderman Wihby said he only had one more question. We had ask to look into cutting vehicles, I thought we were going to have some sort of report on that. It is a different item than this, you are asking for additional vehicle on this. We did say we wanted to cut some in the City.

Chairman Robert stated that we did not. We have the Coh-Chair here the from that Committee that is looking into that. We can probably address that and answer questions.

Mr. Houle started by saying that basically, Chairman Robert, the issues of the cuts are being forwarded to the Advisory Committee on Fleet at its next meeting. Mr. Rist is here today, because of a policy that was developed by transportation Committee, which is now the responsibility of the CIP Committee. The policy

states that “no vehicle shall be acquired by any department without first clearing it through the Committee of Transportation”, and now it is at CIP, this is where it’s at.

Alderman Wihby said that wasn’t followed then. He okayed it through the School Department that told them it was okay.

Mr. Houle said that was correct. We caught it downstairs at the City Clerk. We got a call from the Clerk’s office saying is their authorization for this department to acquire a vehicle? I follow up and in this case it was not. I advised Mr. Rist the same and told him that he had to address this issue to this Committee.

Alderman Wihby asked if the School Department had been advised that they had to come here before they go out and buy a vehicle.

Mr. Houle replied that he did not know about the School Department but Mr. Rist does.

Alderman Wihby noted that the policy was that they should come in front of this Committee to get additional vehicles. Is that what I am hearing?

Mr. Houle said that was correct.

Alderman Wihby continued by saying that we should set up communication to all department. Has the School Department, if I hadn’t done any of this, without us knowing.

Mr. Houle replied no, in fact, there have been some changes. Mark has been talking to me. There has been a failure to communicate this policy with Mr. Rist. I think basically what happened he was unaware of it.

Chairman Robert asked if we were all set now going forward.

Mr. Rist said that in the future we will come to this Committee to ask permission to secure vehicles.

Chairman Robert asked what the Committee wanted to do with this item.

Alderman Wihby said he would also like to send some communication to the School Department so they are aware of the policy.

Chairman Robert asked Alderman Wihby if he would prepare it. Chairman Robert asked if they would amend the original motion to do that.

Alderman Clancy yes he would.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the request to obtain a "G" plate for the Manchester School of Technology for use in the GOAL Program and that a letter be sent to the School Department not to buy any more vehicles until approved by the CIP Committee.

TABLED ITEMS

Report from SPOT Team regarding:
397 Spruce Street, request of Beverly Fosher.
(Originally tabled 3/26/96 - remained on the table 9/30/96 in anticipation of taxes to be received.)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Al Lindquist, A & A Resource Mgt., Inc., requesting the City's assistance to expedite a closing on property located at 241 Crosbie Street which the City held at public auction last year.
(Tabled 6/10/96)

This item remained on the table.

Discussion with representatives from The Sargent Museum relative to their proposal to acquire and renovate City-owned property located at 88 Lowell Street.
(Originally tabled 7/9/96 - remained on the table 9/30/96 and requested Mr. Taylor to pursue going forward with the formation of an agreement for consideration by the Committee.

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Jay Taylor regarding improvements to the corner of Bridge and Elm Streets property.
(Tabled 8/27/96)

This item remained on the table.

Sidewalk Program -

(Note: on 7/31/96 the Committee rescinded its previous action pending a report from the Planning Department.)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Donald Tomilson requesting the Committee review the current ordinance relating to deduct water meters, and suggesting it be amended to provide the same relief from excessive sewer charges for commercial and industrial establishments, as now applies to residential irrigation systems.

(Tabled 10/22/96 pending further report.)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee